

L_h^2 -DOMAINS OF HOLOMORPHY IN THE CLASS OF UNBOUNDED HARTOGS DOMAINS

PETER PFLUG (OLDENBURG) AND WŁODZIMIERZ ZWONEK (KRAKÓW)

ABSTRACT. A characterization of L_h^2 -domains of holomorphy in the class of Hartogs domains in $\mathbb{C}^2$ is given.

There is a precise geometric characterization of bounded L_h^2 -domains of holomorphy. Namely, we have the following

Theorem 1 (see [Pfl-Zwo 1]). *Let D be a bounded pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then D is an L_h^2 -domain of holomorphy if and only if $U \setminus D$ is not pluripolar for any open set U with $U \setminus D \neq \emptyset$.*

As noted by M. A. S. Irgens there is no hope that an analogous result will hold in the unbounded case – it is sufficient to take the domain $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{D}$ (see [Irg]). It is not an L_h^2 -domain of holomorphy (the space $L_h^2(\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{D})$ is trivial), although the geometric condition from Theorem 1 is satisfied.

Therefore, it is natural to try to find a characterization of unbounded L_h^2 -domains of holomorphy. Recall that there is such a characterization in the case of planar domains.

Theorem 2 (see e.g. [Con], Chapter 21.9). *Let D be a domain in $\mathbb{C}$.*

Then D is an L_h^2 -domain of holomorphy if and only if $U \setminus D$ is not polar for any open set U with $U \setminus D \neq \emptyset$.

More precisely, for a point $a \in \partial D$ and an open neighborhood U of a there is an analytic continuation of any function $f \in L_h^2(D)$ onto U if and only if $U \setminus D$ is polar.

Another class of domains in which a full description of L_h^2 -domains of holomorphy is known is the class of Reinhardt domains (see [Jar-Pfl]).

In the paper we present a characterization of L_h^2 -domains of holomorphy in the class of unbounded Hartogs domains with the base being a planar domain. The results of the paper may also be seen as a continuation of results from [Pfl-Zwo 2], where Bergman completeness in the class of unbounded Hartogs domains is studied.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000). Primary: 32A07, 32D05.

The research was supported by DFG Project No. 227/8-1 and was a part of the Research Grant No. 1 PO3A 005 28, which is supported by public means in the programme promoting science in Poland in the years 2005-2008. The second author is a fellow of Rector's Scholarship Fund at the Jagiellonian University

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$ -TEX

For a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ denote by $L_h^2(D)$ the class of square integrable holomorphic functions on D .

Recall that a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is called an L_h^2 -domain of holomorphy if there are no domains $D_0, D_1 \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ with $\emptyset \neq D_0 \subset D_1 \cap D$, $D_1 \not\subset D$ such that for any $f \in L_h^2(D)$ there exists an $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{O}(D_1)$ with $\tilde{f} = f$ on D_0 .

For a subharmonic function $\rho : D \mapsto [-\infty, \infty)$, where D is a domain in $\mathbb{C}$, define

$$G_{D,\rho} := \{(z_1, z_2) \in D \times \mathbb{C} : |z_2| < e^{-\rho(z_1)}\}.$$

The above defined domain $G_{D,\rho}$ is a Hartogs domain with the base equal to D .

For $f \in L_h^2(G_{D,\rho})$ define

$$\rho_f(z_1) := \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{j} \log |f_j(z_1)|, \quad z_1 \in D,$$

where $f(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} f_j(z_1) z_2^j$, $(z_1, z_2) \in D$; f_j 's are the coefficients of the Hartogs expansion of f in $G_{D,\rho}$. Certainly, $\rho_f \leq \rho$ on D , so $\rho_f^* \leq \rho$ on D , where g^* denotes the upper regularization of the function g .

Then define $\tilde{\rho} := \sup_{f \in L_h^2(G_{D,\rho})} \rho_f^*$ on D . Certainly, $\tilde{\rho}^*$ is a subharmonic function on D , $\tilde{\rho}^* \leq \rho$.

For a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ define

$$\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{S}(D) := \{z \in \partial D : U \setminus D \text{ is polar for some open neighborhood } U \text{ of } z\}.$$

Now we may formulate Theorem 2 as follows. The domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ is an L_h^2 -domain of holomorphy iff $\mathcal{S} = \emptyset$.

We also denote by $\mathbb{D}$ the unit disc in $\mathbb{C}$.

Main aim of our paper is the following

Theorem 3. Assume that ρ is bounded from below.

(a) If $D \neq \mathbb{C}$ then $G_{D,\rho}$ is an L_h^2 -domain of holomorphy iff $\limsup_{D \ni z \rightarrow z_0} \rho(z) = \infty$ for any $z_0 \in \mathcal{S}$.

(b) If $D = \mathbb{C}$ then $G_{\mathbb{C},\rho}$ is an L_h^2 -domain of holomorphy iff ρ is not constant.

Let us begin with some lemmas.

Lemma 4. Assume that ρ is bounded from below and let $z_1^0 \in D$ be such that there is no open connected neighborhood $U \subset D$ of z_1^0 such that $\rho|_U$ is constant. Then $\rho(z_1^0) = \tilde{\rho}^*(z_1^0)$.

Proof of Lemma 4. Assume that $\rho \geq M$ on D . Suppose that $\tilde{\rho}^*(z_1^0) < M_1 < \rho(z_1^0)$. Therefore, there is an open disc U with the center at z_1^0 , $U \subset D$ such that $\rho_f(z_1) \leq \rho_f^*(z_1) \leq \tilde{\rho}(z_1) < M_1$ for any $z_1 \in U$ and $f \in L_h^2(G_{D,\rho})$. Therefore, for any $f \in L_h^2(G_{D,\rho})$ the function $\mathcal{F}_f$ defined as

$$\mathcal{F}_f(z_1, z_2) := \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} f_j(z_1) z_2^j, \quad (z_1, z_2) \in U \times e^{-M_1} \mathbb{D},$$

is a well defined holomorphic function – it follows from the Hartogs Lemma that the Hartogs series defining $\mathcal{F}_f$ is locally uniformly convergent in $U \times e^{-M_1} \mathbb{D}$. Certainly,

$\mathcal{F}_f = f$ on $G_{D,\rho} \cap (U \times e^{-M_1}\mathbb{D})$. Therefore, $\mathcal{F}_f$ is a holomorphic continuation of f onto $U \times e^{-M_1}\mathbb{D}$.

On the other hand let $z_2^0 \in \mathbb{C}$ be such that $|z_2^0| = e^{-\rho(z_1^0)}$. Note that $(z_1^0, z_2^0) \in (\partial G_{D,\rho} \cap (U \times e^{-M_1}\mathbb{D}))$. For $z_2 \in e^{-M_1}\mathbb{D}$ define

$$U(z_2) := \{z_1 \in U : (z_1, z_2) \in G_{D,\rho}\}.$$

We claim that there is a $\tilde{z}_2 \in e^{-M_1}\mathbb{D}$ such that $U(\tilde{z}_2) \neq \emptyset$ and $U \setminus U(\tilde{z}_2)$ is not polar. Actually, since $\rho|_U$ is not constant we easily get the existence of a $\tilde{z}_2 \in e^{-M_1}\mathbb{D}$ such that $U(\tilde{z}_2) \neq \emptyset$ and $U(\tilde{z}_2) \neq U$. Note that $U(\tilde{z}_2) = \{z_1 \in U : \rho(z_1) < -\log|\tilde{z}_2|\}$. Suppose that $U \setminus U(\tilde{z}_2)$ is polar. Then $\rho(z_1) \geq -\log|\tilde{z}_2|$ for any $z_1 \in U(\tilde{z}_2)$. Since $U \setminus U(\tilde{z}_2)$ is polar, $\rho(z_1) \geq -\log|\tilde{z}_2|$ for any $z_1 \in U$, so $U(\tilde{z}_2) = \emptyset$ – contradiction. Therefore, $U \setminus U(\tilde{z}_2) \neq \emptyset$ is not polar. In particular, there is a function $f \in L_h^2(V_1 \times \{\tilde{z}_2\})$, where $V_1 := \{z_1 \in D : (z_1, \tilde{z}_2) \in G_{D,\rho}\}$, which does not have a holomorphic continuation on $U \times \{\tilde{z}_2\}$ (see Theorem 2).

It follows from a result of T. Ohsawa (see [Ohs]), applied to $\Psi(\cdot) := 2g_{e^{-M_1}\mathbb{D}}(\tilde{z}_2, \cdot)$ ($g_D(p, \cdot)$ denotes the Green function of the domain D with the logarithmic pole at p), that there is a function $F \in L_h^2(G_{D,\rho})$ such that $F|_{V_1 \times \{\tilde{z}_2\}} \equiv f$ (here and later making use of the result of T. Ohsawa we utilize a formulation from the paper [Chen-Kam-Ohs], p. 706). But it follows from the earlier property that F extends to a holomorphic function on $U \times e^{-M_1}\mathbb{D}$. Therefore, f extends holomorphically onto $U \times \{\tilde{z}_2\}$ – contradiction. $\square$

Remark. Let us make a remark on the proof of the above lemma. We provided the proof with the help of a new extension result of T. Ohsawa. The result in [Ohs] applies to the unbounded case (unlike the one in the standard version of the extension theorem in [Ohs-Tak]) but there are some limits. Namely, the possibility of the extension of an L_h^2 -function from the hyperplane depends on the existence of a suitable plurisubharmonic function Ψ – in our proof this is the Green function of the projection of the domain $G_{D,\rho}$ onto the second variable. At this place it is important that the projection is bounded, in other words that the function ρ is bounded from below.

Lemma 5. *Let ρ be bounded from below and not constant and let $z_1^0 \in D$ be such that there is an open connected neighborhood $U \subset D$ of z_1^0 such that $\rho|_U$ is constant. Then $\tilde{\rho}^* \equiv \rho$ on U .*

Proof of Lemma 5. Let $\tilde{V}_1$ denote the set of all $z_1 \in D$ such that there is an open neighborhood V of z_1 such that $\rho|_V$ is constant. Certainly $\tilde{V}_1$ is open and $\tilde{V}_1 \supset U$. Denote by V_1 the connected component of $\tilde{V}_1$ such that $V_1 \supset U$. Then $\rho|_{V_1} \equiv C$ for some $C \in \mathbb{R}$.

We claim that

$$(*) \quad \tilde{\rho}^* \text{ is constant on } V_1.$$

Without loss of generality assume that $\tilde{\rho}^* \neq -\infty$. Then $(\tilde{\rho}^*)^{-1}(-\infty)$ is polar. We observe that in order to prove $(*)$ it is sufficient to show the following property:

$$(**) \quad \text{For any } z_1 \in V_1 \text{ such that } \tilde{\rho}^*(z_1) > -\infty \text{ there is an open neighborhood } U(z_1) \subset V_1 \text{ of } z_1 \text{ such that } \tilde{\rho}^* \text{ is constant on } U(z_1).$$

First we prove the implication $((**) \Rightarrow (*))$. Assume that $(**)$ holds. Then the set $\{z_1 \in V_1 : \tilde{\rho}^*(z_1) > -\infty\}$ is open, so $(\tilde{\rho}^*)^{-1}(-\infty) \cap V_1$ is closed in V_1 and polar. Therefore, the set $\{z_1 \in V_1 : \tilde{\rho}^*(z_1) > -\infty\}$ is connected. But $\tilde{\rho}^*$ is locally constant there, so it is constant on $V_1 \setminus (\tilde{\rho}^*)^{-1}(-\infty)$. The subharmonicity of $\tilde{\rho}^*$ implies that $\tilde{\rho}^*$ is constant on V_1 .

Now we show the property $(**)$.

Suppose that there is a $\tilde{z}_1 \in V_1$ such that $(\tilde{\rho})^*(\tilde{z}_1) > -\infty$ and $\tilde{\rho}^*$ is not constant on any neighborhood of $\tilde{z}_1$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\tilde{\rho}^*(\tilde{z}_1) < \rho(\tilde{z}_1)$. Let $-\infty < M < \tilde{\rho}^*(\tilde{z}_1)$ and $M \leq \rho$ on D . The function $\psi := \max\{M, \frac{\rho + \tilde{\rho}^*}{2}\}$ defined on D is subharmonic, bounded from below, $\psi \leq \rho$, $\tilde{\rho}^*(\tilde{z}_1) < \psi(\tilde{z}_1) < \rho(\tilde{z}_1)$ and ψ is not constant on any neighborhood of $\tilde{z}_1$.

Let $\tilde{\psi}$ denote the function defined for ψ analogously to the way the function $\tilde{\rho}$ was defined for ρ . Note that $\tilde{\psi}^* \leq \tilde{\rho}^*$ on D , so $\tilde{\psi}^*(\tilde{z}_1) \leq \tilde{\rho}^*(\tilde{z}_1) < \psi(\tilde{z}_1)$. However, it follows from Lemma 4 applied to ψ that $\psi(\tilde{z}_1) = \tilde{\psi}^*(\tilde{z}_1)$ – contradiction.

Consequently, $(*)$ is satisfied, so $\tilde{\rho}^* \equiv \tilde{C} \in [-\infty, \infty)$ on V_1 .

We want to show that $\tilde{\rho}^* \equiv \tilde{C} = C \equiv \rho$ on V_1 . If $D \setminus V_1$ is polar then ρ is constant on D – contradiction. Therefore, $D \setminus V_1$ is not polar, so $\partial V_1 \cap D$ is not polar, either. Therefore, there is a point $\tilde{z}_1 \in \partial V_1 \cap D$ such that V_1 is not thin at $\tilde{z}_1$, so $\tilde{\rho}^*(\tilde{z}_1) = \tilde{C}$; moreover, ρ is not constant on any neighborhood of $\tilde{z}_1$, so in view of Lemma 4, $\tilde{\rho}^*(\tilde{z}_1) = \rho(\tilde{z}_1) = C$, so $C = \tilde{C}$. $\square$

As a consequence of Lemmas 4 and 5 we get the following result.

Corollary 6. *Let ρ be bounded from below and not constant. Then $\rho = \tilde{\rho}^*$ on D .*

Let us define $\hat{D}$ to be the set of points from D and those points $\hat{z}_1 \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\limsup_{D \ni z_1 \rightarrow \hat{z}_1} \rho(z_1) < \infty$. Note that $\hat{D}$ is a domain with $D \subset \hat{D} \subset D \cup \mathcal{S}$. We may also define the function

$$\hat{\rho}(\hat{z}_1) := \begin{cases} \rho(z_1), & \text{if } z_1 \in D, \\ \limsup_{D \ni z_1 \rightarrow \hat{z}_1} \rho(z_1), & \text{if } z_1 \in \tilde{D} \setminus D. \end{cases}$$

Note that $\hat{\rho}$ is subharmonic on $\hat{D}$.

Proof of Theorem 3. Let $\rho \geq M$ on D .

If ρ is constant, $\mathcal{S} = \emptyset$ and $\mathbb{C} \setminus D$ is not polar then the domain D is an L_h^2 -domain of holomorphy (see Theorem 2) and $G_{D,\rho} = D \times e^{-M_1} \mathbb{D}$ for some $M_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ ($M_1 \equiv \rho$). Consequently, $G_{D,\rho}$ is an L_h^2 -domain of holomorphy.

First we show the sufficiency of the condition.

Assume that $\limsup_{D \ni z \rightarrow z_0} \rho(z) = \infty$ for any $z_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ and that ρ is not constant (in the case $\mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$ the latter condition follows directly from the first one). Suppose that $G_{D,\rho}$ is not the L_h^2 -domain of holomorphy. Then there are discs $P_j, Q_j, j = 1, 2$ such that $P_j \subset \subset Q_j, j = 1, 2, P := P_1 \times P_2 \subset G_{D,\rho}, \partial G_{D,\rho} \cap \partial P \neq \emptyset$ and for any $f \in L_h^2(G_{D,\rho})$ there is a $g \in \mathcal{O}(Q_1 \times Q_2)$ such that $f = g$ on $P_1 \times P_2$.

Let us consider three cases.

Case I. $\partial P \cap \partial G_{D,\rho} \subset \mathcal{S} \times \mathbb{C}$. Then our assumption implies that there is a point $(z_1^0, z_2^0) \in \partial P \cap \partial G_{D,\rho}$ such that $z_1^0 \in \mathcal{S}, z_2^0 \neq 0$ and $z_2^0 \in P_2$. Consider the set

$$U := \{z_1 \in Q_1 \cap D : (z_1, z_2^0) \in G_{D,\rho}\}$$

Note that $U \neq \emptyset$ (because $P_1 \subset U$). Note also that $Q_1 \setminus U$ is not polar. In fact, the assumption on the boundary behaviour of ρ implies that there is a point $\tilde{z}_1 \in Q_1 \cap D$ such that $(\tilde{z}_1, z_2^0) \notin G_{D,\rho}$, so $\rho(\tilde{z}_1) \geq -\log|z_2^0|$. The existence of only a polar set of such points would, however, lead to contradiction with the mean value property of subharmonic functions. Therefore, there is a function $f \in L_h^2(\tilde{U})$, where $\tilde{U} := \{z_1 \in D : (z_1, z_2^0) \in G_{D,\rho}\}$, which does not have a holomorphic continuation on Q_1 (see [Con]). There is a function $F \in L_h^2(G_{D,\rho})$ such that $F(z_1, z_2^0) = f(z_1)$, $z_1 \in \tilde{U}$ (apply [Ohs] with $\Psi(z_1, z_2) := 2g_{e^{-M}\mathbb{D}}(z_2^0, z_2)$). But such a function F has a holomorphic continuation on $Q_1 \times Q_2$, from which we conclude the existence of a holomorphic continuation of f on Q_1 – contradiction.

Case II. $\partial P \cap \partial G_{D,\rho} \cap ((\partial D \setminus \mathcal{S}) \times \mathbb{C}) \neq \emptyset$. The proof in this case is similar to that in Case I. There is a point $(z_1^0, z_2^0) \in \partial P \cap \partial G_{D,\rho}$ such that $z_1^0 \in \partial D \setminus \mathcal{S}$ and $z_2^0 \in P_2$ (but we have no guarantee that we may assume additionally that $z_2^0 \neq 0$). Consider the set

$$U := \{z_1 \in Q_1 \cap D : (z_1, z_2^0) \in G_{D,\rho}\}$$

Note that $U \neq \emptyset$ (because $P_1 \subset U$). Note also that $Q_1 \setminus U$ is not polar. In fact, this follows directly from the fact that $z_1^0 \in \partial D \setminus \mathcal{S}$, definition of $\mathcal{S}$ and the inclusion $Q_1 \setminus D \subset Q_1 \setminus U$. Therefore, there is a function $f \in L_h^2(\tilde{U})$, where $\tilde{U} := \{z_1 \in D : (z_1, z_2^0) \in G_{D,\rho}\}$, which does not have a holomorphic continuation on Q_1 (see Theorem 2). But then the function F defined by the formula $F(z_1, z_2) := f(z_1)$, $(z_1, z_2) \in G_{D,\rho}$ is from the class $L_h^2(G_{D,\rho})$. But such a function F has a holomorphic continuation on $Q_1 \times Q_2$, from which we conclude the existence of a holomorphic continuation of f on Q_1 – contradiction.

Case III. $\partial P \cap \partial G_{D,\rho} \cap (D \times \mathbb{C}) \neq \emptyset$.

Denote by $M_1 := \sup\{|z_2| : z_2 \in P_2\}$, $M_2 := \sup\{|z_2| : z_2 \in Q_2\}$. Then $0 < M_1 < M_2$. From our assumption we conclude the existence of a point $\tilde{z}_1 \in \bar{P}_1 \cap D$ such that $\rho(\tilde{z}_1) \geq -\log M_1$. On the other hand the extension property implies that for any $f \in L_h^2(G_{D,\rho})$ and for any $z_1 \in P_1$ the inequality $e^{-\rho_f(z_1)} \geq M_2$ holds, so $\tilde{\rho}^*(z_1) \leq -\log M_2$, $z_1 \in P_1$, implying the inequality $\tilde{\rho}^*(\tilde{z}_1) \leq -\log M_2 < -\log M_1$, which contradicts the equality $\rho(\tilde{z}_1) = \tilde{\rho}^*(\tilde{z}_1)$ following from Corollary 6.

Now we prove the necessity of the condition.

Recall that $\hat{D} \setminus D$ is a polar set. Therefore, $(\hat{D} \setminus D) \cap G_{\hat{D},\hat{\rho}}$ is pluripolar. Since L_h^2 -holomorphic functions extend through pluripolar sets it is easy to see that $L_h^2(G_{D,\rho}) = L_h^2(G_{\hat{D},\hat{\rho}}|_{G_{D,\rho}})$, which gives us the necessity of the condition.

□

The following description of L_h^2 -holomorphic hulls of domains $G_{D,\rho}$ follows from Theorem 3 and its proof.

Corollary 7. *Assume that ρ is bounded from below. Assume that $\mathbb{C} \setminus D$ is not polar or ρ is not constant. Then the L_h^2 -holomorphic hull of $G_{D,\rho}$ equals $G_{\hat{D},\hat{\rho}}$. If $\mathbb{C} \setminus D$ is polar and ρ is constant then the L_h^2 -holomorphic hull of $G_{D,\rho}$ equals $\mathbb{C}^2$.*

Remark. The problem of a full understanding of the structure of L_h^2 -domains of holomorphy is far from being solved. For instance, a natural question whether we may remove the assumption of lower boundedness of the function ρ in Theorem 3 remains open. On the other hand the methods used in the paper may be easily transferred to Hartogs domains with higher dimensional bases. However, because

of the lack of the full description of L_h^2 -domains of holomorphy in $\mathbb{C}^n$, $n \geq 2$, the results obtained in this case would be much more incomplete. We think that to find a complete characterization of L_h^2 -domains of holomorphy in the class of Hartogs domains in two dimensional case (as well as in higher dimensional case of Hartogs domains or even in the general case of unbounded domains), a completely different approach to the problem should be found.

Some other problems remain also open. For instance, is it true that if D is a pseudoconvex domain, D is locally an L_h^2 -domain of holomorphy (which means that the geometric condition from Theorem 1 is satisfied) and $L_h^2(D) \neq \{0\}$ then D must be an L_h^2 -domain of holomorphy. Another natural problem would be to find a description of L_h^p -domains of holomorphy.

We finish the paper with presenting some sufficient condition for a pseudoconvex domain D to have infinitely dimensional Bergman space $L_h^2(D)$. This gives a partial answer to the following problem. Is there a pseudoconvex domain having finite dimensional but non-trivial Bergman space? A non-pseudoconvex example of that type was given in [Wie].

Proposition 8. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, $D \neq \mathbb{C}^n$, be an L_h^2 -domain of holomorphy and let $\{\varphi_j\}_{j \in J}$ be a complete orthonormal system in $L_h^2(D)$. Assume that there is an open set U such that $U \cap D \neq \emptyset$, $U \not\subset D$ and for any $j \in J$ the function φ_j has an analytic continuation onto U . Then $\dim L_h^2(G_{D,\rho}) = \infty$. In particular, any L_h^2 -domain of holomorphy, which is balanced, a Hartogs domain or a Laurent-Hartogs domain different from $\mathbb{C}^n$, has infinitely dimensional Bergman space.*

Proof. Suppose the contrary. Then J is finite and $J \neq \emptyset$. Since D is an L_h^2 -domain of holomorphy there is a function $f \in L_h^2(D)$, which does not have an analytic continuation onto U . But $f = \sum_{j \in J} \lambda_j \varphi_j$, where $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{C}$. Since J is finite f has analytic continuation onto U – contradiction. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [Chen-Kam-Ohs] Bo-Yong Chen, J. Kamimoto, T. Ohsawa, *Behavior of the Bergman kernel at infinity*, Math. Z. **248** (2004), 695–708.
- [Con] J. B. Conway, *Functions of One Complex Variable II*, vol. 159, Graduate Texts in Math., 1995.
- [Irg] M. A. S. Irgens, *Continuation of L^2 -holomorphic functions*, Math. Z. **247**(3) (2004), 611–617.
- [Jar-Pfl] M. Jarnicki & P. Pflug, *Existence domains of holomorphic functions of restricted growth*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **304** (1987), 385–404.
- [Ohs-Tak] T. Ohsawa & K. Takegoshi, *On the extension of L^2 -holomorphic functions*, Math. Z. **195** (1987), 197–204.
- [Ohs] T. Ohsawa, *On the extension of L^2 holomorphic functions – Effects of generalization* **161** (2001), 1–21.
- [Pfl-Zwo 1] P. Pflug & W. Zwonek, *L_h^2 -domains of holomorphy and the Bergman kernel*, Studia Math. **151**(2) (2002), 99–108.
- [Pfl-Zwo 2] P. Pflug & W. Zwonek, *Bergman completeness of unbounded Hartogs domains*, Nagoya Math. J. (to appear).
- [Wie] J. Wierginck, *Domains with finite dimensional Bergman space*, Math. Z. **187** (1984), 559–562.

CARL VON OSSIETZKY UNIVERSITÄT OLDENBURG, INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, POSTFACH 2503, D-26111 OLDENBURG, GERMANY

UNIWERSYTET JAGIELLOŃSKI, INSTYTUT MATEMATYKI, REYMONTA 4, 30-059 KRAKÓW, POLAND

E-mail address: pflug@mathematik.uni-oldenburg, Wlodzimierz.Zwonek@im.uj.edu.pl